

1 DANIEL G. SWANSON, SBN 116556  
2 dswanson@gibsondunn.com  
3 GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP  
333 South Grand Avenue  
3 Los Angeles, CA 90071  
4 Telephone: 213.229.7000  
Facsimile: 213.229.7520

5 CYNTHIA E. RICHMAN (D.C. Bar No.  
492089; *pro hac vice*)  
6 erichman@gibsondunn.com  
7 GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036  
8 Telephone: 202.955.8500  
Facsimile: 202.467.0539

9 JULIAN W. KLEINBRODT, SBN 302085  
10 jkleinbrodt@gibsondunn.com  
11 GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP  
One Embarcadero Center, Suite 2600  
12 San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: 415.393.8200  
Facsimile: 415.393.8306

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

MARK A. PERRY, SBN 212532  
mark.perry@weil.com  
JOSHUA M. WESNESKI (D.C. Bar No.  
1500231; *pro hac vice*)  
joshua.wesneski@weil.com  
WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP  
2001 M Street NW, Suite 600  
Washington, DC 20036  
Telephone: 202.682.7000  
Facsimile: 202.857.0940

MORGAN D. MACBRIDE, SBN 301248  
morgan.macbride@weil.com  
WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP  
Redwood Shores Pkwy, 4th Floor  
Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
Telephone: 650.802.3044  
Facsimile: 650.802.3100

Attorneys for Defendant APPLE INC.

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
OAKLAND DIVISION

EPIC GAMES, INC.

Case No. 4:20-cv-05640-YGR

Plaintiff, Counter-defendant  
v.

**APPLE INC.'S ADMINISTRATIVE  
MOTION TO SEAL**

APPLE INC.,

The Honorable Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers

Defendant, Counterclaimant

1 **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
2 <b>LEGAL STANDARD.....</b>	1
3 <b>DISCUSSION.....</b>	2
4 <b>CONCLUSION.....</b>	3

1 TABLE OF AUTHORITIES  
23 Page(s)4 Cases

5 <i>Al Otro Lado, Inc. v. Wolf</i> , 2020 WL 5422784 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 10, 2020).....	2
6 <i>In re Anthem, Inc. Data Breach Litig.</i> , 2018 WL 3067783 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 16, 2018).....	1, 2
7 <i>Apple Inc. v. Rivos, Inc.</i> , 2024 WL 1204115 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 21, 2024).....	2, 3
9 <i>DNA Genotek Inc. v. Spectrum Sols., L.L.C.</i> , 2023 WL 4335734 (S.D. Cal. May 10, 2023).....	1, 2
11 <i>Ervine v. Warden</i> , 214 F. Supp. 3d 917 (E.D. Cal. 2016).....	1
12 <i>Kamakana v. City and Cnty. of Honolulu</i> , 447 F.3d 1172 (9th Cir. 2006) .....	1, 2
14 <i>Krommenhock v. Post Foods, LLC</i> , 2020 WL 2322993 (N.D. Cal. May 11, 2020).....	3
16 <i>Lamartina v. VMware, Inc.</i> , 2024 WL 3049450 (N.D. Cal. June 17, 2024).....	2
17 <i>Lee v. Great Am. Life Ins. Co.</i> , 2023 WL 8126850 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 13, 2023).....	2
19 <i>Phillips v. Gen. Motors Corp.</i> , 307 F.3d 1206 (9th Cir. 2002) .....	1, 3
21 <i>PQ Labs, Inc. v. Qi</i> , 2014 WL 4617216 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 15, 2014) .....	1
22 <i>Rembrandt Diagnostics, LP v. Innovacon, Inc.</i> , 2018 WL 1001097 (S.D. Cal. Feb. 21, 2018).....	1, 2
24 <i>Vineyard House, LLC v. Constellation Brands U.S. Ops., Inc.</i> , 619 F. Supp. 3d 970 (N.D. Cal. 2021) .....	2
26 <i>Virun, Inc. v. Cymbiotika, LLC</i> , 2022 WL 17401698 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 19, 2022) .....	3
27 <i>Williams v. Apple Inc.</i> , 2021 WL 2476916 (N.D. Cal. June 17, 2021).....	3

1 **Other Authorities**

2	Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c) .....	1
3	Local Rule 79-5.....	1
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

1 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c) and Local Rule 79-5, Apple Inc. (“Apple”)  
 2 respectfully moves the Court to seal portions of the December 9, 2024 Joint Case Management  
 3 Statement, submitted pursuant to the Standing Order for all Judges of the Northern District of California,  
 4 Civil Local Rule 16-9, the Court’s Standing Order in Civil Cases, and the Court’s Minute Entry of  
 5 November 4, 2024 (Dkt. 1048). The Joint Case Management Statement contains information sealable  
 6 under controlling law and Local Rule 79-5. Specifically, this document contains competitively sensitive,  
 7 non-public information regarding Apple’s business codenames regarding ongoing confidential projects.  
 8 Apple’s proposed redactions of that information are highlighted in **YELLOW** in the un-redacted version  
 9 of the Joint Case Management Statement that Apple is filing under seal and is itemized in the  
 10 concurrently filed Declaration of Mark A. Perry (the “Perry Declaration”).

11 **LEGAL STANDARD**

12 “The court may, for good cause, issue an order to protect a party or person from annoyance,  
 13 embarrassment, oppression, or undue burden or expense,” including preventing the disclosure of  
 14 information. *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c)*. The Court has “broad latitude” “to prevent disclosure of materials  
 15 for many types of information, including, *but not limited to*, trade secrets or other confidential research,  
 16 development, or confidential information.” *Phillips v. Gen. Motors Corp.*, 307 F.3d 1206, 1211 (9th  
 17 Cir. 2002) (emphasis in original); *see also Kamakana v. City and Cnty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172,  
 18 1178 (9th Cir. 2006) (compelling circumstances exist to seal potential release of trade secrets) (citing  
 19 *Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 598 (1978)); *PQ Labs, Inc. v. Qi*, 2014 WL 4617216,  
 20 at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 15, 2014) (granting multiple motions to seal where publication would lead to the  
 21 disclosure of trade secrets); *Apple Inc. v. Rivos, Inc.*, 2024 WL 1204115, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 21, 2024)  
 22 (granting request to seal “internal product codenames” and noting that a prior request for the same had  
 23 also been granted).

24 Although a party must show compelling circumstances to seal information appended to  
 25 dispositive motions, the standard for non-dispositive motions is “good cause.” *In re Anthem, Inc. Data*  
 26 *Breach Litig.*, 2018 WL 3067783, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 16, 2018); *Rembrandt Diagnostics, LP v.*  
 27 *Innovacon, Inc.*, 2018 WL 1001097, at \*1 (S.D. Cal. Feb. 21, 2018); *see DNA Genotek Inc. v. Spectrum*  
 28 *Sols., L.L.C.*, 2023 WL 4335734, at \*2 (S.D. Cal. May 10, 2023). In general, requests to seal information

1 should be narrowly tailored “to remove from public view only the material that is protected.” *Ervine v.*  
 2 *Warden*, 214 F. Supp. 3d 917, 919 (E.D. Cal. 2016); *Vineyard House, LLC v. Constellation Brands U.S.*  
 3 *Ops., Inc.*, 619 F. Supp. 3d 970, 972 n.2 (N.D. Cal. 2021) (Gonzalez Rogers, J.) (granting a motion to  
 4 seal “because the request is narrowly tailored and only includes confidential information”).

## 5 DISCUSSION

6 Apple seeks to seal sensitive business information regarding internal business codenames  
 7 regarding ongoing confidential projects. *See* Perry Decl. ¶ 5. Specifically, the Parties are filing a Joint  
 8 Case Management Statement and Epic’s portion includes codenames regarding projects that Apple has  
 9 not made public. Magistrate Judge Thomas S. Hixson recently granted Apple’s sealing request for  
 10 identical information that Apple requests be sealed here. *See* Dkt. 1057. The information reveals  
 11 sensitive information about Apple’s confidential business decisions, and documents including these  
 12 codenames have already been marked as highly confidential in the course of discovery and have not  
 13 been challenged by Epic under the extant protective order. *See id.* ¶¶ 4–5.

14 At the outset, Apple’s administrative motion to seal is subject to the “good cause” standard  
 15 because it concerns non-dispositive joint statements regarding discovery. *See, e.g.*, *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d  
 16 at 1179 (“[T]he public has less of a need for access to court records attached only to non-dispositive  
 17 motions because those documents are often unrelated, or only tangentially related, to the underlying  
 18 cause of action.”); *Lee v. Great Am. Life Ins. Co.*, 2023 WL 8126850, at \*2 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 13, 2023)  
 19 (“Matters concerning discovery generally are considered nondispositive of the litigation”) (quotation  
 20 omitted); *see also In re Anthem, Inc. Data Breach Litig.*, 2018 WL 3067783, at \*2; *Rembrandt*  
 21 *Diagnostics, LP*, 2018 WL 1001097, at \*1; *Al Otro Lado, Inc. v. Wolf*, 2020 WL 5422784, at \*4 (S.D.  
 22 Cal. Sept. 10, 2020).

23 Apple easily meets the good cause standard here. *Lamartina v. VMware, Inc.*, 2024 WL  
 24 3049450, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. June 17, 2024) (good cause to seal internal email communications). Apple’s  
 25 limited proposed redactions protect against the harmful disclosure of Apple’s internal business decision-  
 26 making, including non-public project codenames. *See DNA Genotek Inc.*, 2023 WL 4335734, at \*2  
 27 (finding good cause where disclosure would “undercut” a party’s “position … in the marketplace”);  
 28 *Apple Inc.*, 2024 WL 1204115, at \*1. Indeed, courts routinely hold that the type of at issue here is

1 sealable because its disclosure can be competitively harmful when a company’s confidential information  
 2 is revealed. *See, e.g., Virun, Inc. v. Cymbiotika, LLC*, 2022 WL 17401698, at \*2 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 19,  
 3 2022) (“Courts in this Circuit have found potential harms arising from public disclosure of trade secrets  
 4 or a business’ confidential financial and pricing information to be sufficient reason to seal”); *Apple Inc.*,  
 5 2024 WL 1204115, at \*1 (granting request to seal “references to[ ] internal product codenames”). Apple  
 6 operates in an intensely competitive environment, and thus has taken extensive measures to protect the  
 7 confidentiality of its information. *See* Perry Decl. ¶ 3. Disclosure of the sealed information could harm  
 8 Apple’s business interests. *Id.* ¶ 4.

9 Moreover, Apple has narrowly tailored its sealing request to include only the information  
 10 necessary to protect Apple’s confidential business information. *See* Perry Decl. ¶ 6; *Krommenhock v.*  
 11 *Post Foods, LLC*, 2020 WL 2322993, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. May 11, 2020) (granting motion to seal “limited”  
 12 information); *see also Phillips*, 307 F.3d at 1211; *Williams v. Apple Inc.*, 2021 WL 2476916, at \*2–\*3  
 13 (N.D. Cal. June 17, 2021) (noting Apple’s narrowed sealing requests with “tailored redactions” and  
 14 finding “most of Apple’s sealing requests[ ] appropriate” to the extent the disclosures “would harm  
 15 Apple’s competitive standing”); Dkt. No. 643 at 3 (finding Apple’s proposed redactions appropriate for  
 16 an exhibit when redactions were “narrowly tailored” to “sensitive and confidential information, the  
 17 disclosure of which would result in competitive harm to Apple”). Apple has only partially redacted one  
 18 line of text in the Joint Case Management Statement. The remainder of the Joint Case Management  
 19 Statement remains unredacted. *See* Perry Decl. ¶ 6.

20 For the foregoing reasons, there is good cause that warrants partially sealing the Joint Case  
 21 Management Statement.

## 22 CONCLUSION

23 Apple respectfully requests that the Court seal the identified information.

24 Dated: December 9, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

25 By: *[s/ Mark A. Perry*  
 26 Mark A. Perry  
 27 WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP

28 Attorney for Apple Inc.